

POPE SYLVESTER II AND STEPHEN I OF HUNGARY.

ALTHOUGH the bull said to have been issued by Sylvester II to the first king of Hungary is admitted by competent authorities to be a forgery, presumably of the seventeenth century,¹ it may not be without interest to give a short account of the present state of the controversy among Hungarian scholars relative to the question.

The orthodox story is that the son of the last duke of Hungary, the latter having embraced Christianity, applied to the pope about the year 1000 for a crown, which request was readily granted. The crown was subsequently united with another sent by the emperor of the East to Géza I (after 1074), and the two diadems thus conjoined form the present 'holy crown' or 'St. Stephen's crown,' used at the coronation of the kings of Hungary. Accompanying his gift Sylvester II is said to have issued a bull investing Stephen and his successors with the full powers of a papal legate; and in token of this office the Hungarian kings have ever since borne the title of 'Apostolic King' and enjoyed the privilege of having an apostolic double cross carried before them on solemn occasions. The double cross appears as the principal charge on the sinister half of the Hungarian escutcheon.

In 1880 a committee was appointed by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences to examine the coronation insignia, and the results of its inquiries were published by Dr. Arnold Ipolyi, bishop of Neusohl, one of its members.² The official position this prelate held in the Roman church has probably biassed him in favour of the old view, but the facts contained in his book can lead only to the conclusion that, even if the story related in the legend of the life of the king is true, and Sylvester II did really send a crown to Stephen, not a vestige of it can be seen in the present 'holy crown.' This consists of a crown of Byzantine workmanship,³ which was originally open (*i.e.* a 'stephanos'), but was subsequently transformed into a closed crown (*i.e.* a 'stemma') by having two cross-bands surmounted by a cross soldered to the open hoop. The bands are embellished with the images of the Saviour and *eight* apostles in enamel of apparently western design, if not workmanship. It is difficult to believe that the crown sent by Sylvester was broken up and that only a small portion of the material was embodied in the

¹ Jaffé, *Regesta Pontificum*, i. (ed. 2, 1885) 497; Wattenbach in *Monum. Germ. Hist.*, Script. xi. (1854) 233, n. 35.

² *A magyar szent korona és a koronázási jelvények leírása és története*. Budapest, 1886. The Hungarian coronation insignia have been described also by Canon Bock, Ivánfi, Dr. Hampel, Charles Pulszky, and others.

³ The Byzantine crown is embellished with the images (in enamel) of various Greek saints in addition to those of the donor Michael Doukas, his son Constantine Porphyrogenetos (the younger), and the king of Hungary, whose image bears the following inscription in Greek characters: ΓΕΩΡΓΙΤΖ Δ'Ο ΠΙΝΤΟC ΚΡΑΛΗC ΤΟΥΡΚΙΑC (of Turkey, *i.e.* Hungary)

existing crown, as the hoop which formed the base of the original diadem, and probably also the images of four of the apostles, are missing.⁴ Hence it is probable that the bands in question originally did not form part of a crown at all, but were merely utilised in transforming the open crown into a closed one, and that probably the images of the other four apostles were on the extremities of the existing bands, but were cut off.

Some Hungarian writers are beginning to doubt whether Sylvester ever did send a crown to Stephen. For when Gregory VII claimed Hungary as a fief in 1074 he made no allusion to any such gift. The only Hungarian crown mentioned in his correspondence is the one which together with a spear was forwarded to Rome by the emperor Henry III, after his victory at Ménfő in 1044, where he had the good fortune to capture the Hungarian king Aba with his crown and spear. Nor did Gregory refer to any bull or any other document.⁵

As regards the title of 'apostolic king' another Hungarian bishop, Monsignor Fraknói, has lately published a volume on the wider subject of the history of the Hungarian king's powers as patron of the state-church, a treatise based to a large extent on hitherto unpublished material.⁶ The author shows that the title in question was assumed only a few centuries ago, and that at the outset it was a mere title, conferring no privilege whatever on the bearer. The first attempt to obtain an official grant or acknowledgment from Rome was made by Louis II when Pope Leo X granted to Henry VIII of England the title of 'defender of the faith.' Another attempt—again ineffectual—was made by Ferdinand III in 1627. Some years later, in 1649, we find the Hungarian prelates

⁴ Dr. Ipolyi gives an illustration of the crown as he thinks it may have looked when received from Sylvester. Another such imaginary sketch figures in Dr. Bock's latest contribution to the literature of the subject (*De corona S. Stephani*, Aachen, 1898), in which he still maintains that the cross hoops forming the upper portion of the crown were made in Rome at the end of the tenth century. On the other hand N. P. Kondakov, basing his opinion on the style of the workmanship only, assigns them to the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century (*Byzantinische Zellen-E-mails*, Frankfurt, 1892, p. 239). Julius Pauler, the author of the latest standard book of history of Hungary during the reign of the Árpád dynasty, surmises that it was the crown sent by Sylvester that was captured by the German emperor at Ménfő and returned by him to Rome. Not a vestige of it is known at present. According to Ciampini the spear was still in existence in his time (*De sacris aedificiis*, Romae, 1698, p. 79).

⁵ In 1074 the pope writes to King Solomon of Hungary as follows: 'Sicut a maioribus patriae tuae cognoscere potes, regnum Ungariae sanctae Romanae ecclesiae proprium est, a rege Stephano olim beato Petro cum omni iure et potestate sua oblatum et devote traditum.' In the next sentence he states that 'Henricus [III] pie memoriae imperator, ad honorem sancti Petri regnum illud expugnatum victo rege [Ovone] et facta victoria ad corpus beati Petri lanceam, coronamque transmisit; et pro gloria triumphii sui illud regni direxit insignia, quo principatum dignitatis eius attinere cognovit.' See Jaffé's *Monumenta Gregoriana* p. 128 (Berlin, 1865).

⁶ *A magyar királyság kegyelmi jog szent Istvántól Mária Teréziáig*, by W. Fraknói. Budapest, 1895.

engaged in a controversy with the pope, defending their king's right to nominate candidates to vacant sees or to translate bishops as he pleased by virtue of his power as apostolic king. In reply, the pope denies the existence of any such power or the validity of any such title, and refers the Magyar prelates to the 'Annals' of Baronius and to the 'Life of Saint Stephen, the king,' by Hartvicus, both of which authorities make the investiture with the title of 'apostolic' and with legatine powers a purely personal distinction conferred on Stephen, and not transmitted to his successors.⁷ Again no reference was made by either party to any bull of Sylvester II, though the text of that famous document had already, in 1644, been published—and at Rome—by the Jesuit Melchior Inchofer in his 'Annales Ecclesiastici Regni Hungariæ.'⁸ The right to the title of 'apostolic king' was, in fact, not acknowledged by the pope till 1758, when, as almost the first act after his accession, Clement XIII granted it to Maria Theresa and her successors on the throne of Hungary, together with the privilege of having the apostolic double cross borne before her and them by a bishop. In his letter the pope refers to the practice and privilege as one the origin of which is unknown to him. The double cross among the coronation insignia is quite modern.

On the other hand, the apostolic double cross as an heraldic charge first appeared on a seal of Béla IV in 1243. From that date onward for about seventy years it formed the sole charge in the royal arms until the first Angevin king, Charles Robert, discontinued its use, and resumed that of the more ancient shield barry of eight, with which he impaled his own coat of lilies. The regular use of the arms of Hungary as they are arranged at present dates only from the reign of 'king' Maria Theresa.

Bishop Fraknói does not mention the fact that not even Stephen I himself made use of the title of 'apostolic king.' It is true that in a document attributed to him he is made to style himself 'Dei miseratione et apostolicae Sedis gratia Hungarorum Rex,' but the charter in question is a clumsy forgery. Apart from its glaring anachronisms the document displays ignorance not only of the formulae used in Stephen's chancery, but also of the history of the religious house in whose favour it was fabricated. There are about half a score of undoubtedly genuine charters by Stephen extant, and in all of these he is simply styled 'Stephanus, Dei Gratia

⁷ The author of the life was a Bishop Hartvicus, who dedicated his book to Coloman, king of Hungary (1095–1116). For the latest phase of the controversy about the authorship see the *Acta Sanctorum*, November, t. ii., p. 479, which gives a bibliography of the literature down to 1894. Since then further contributions on the subject have appeared by Julius Pauer and Dr. Karácsonyi in vol. xxviii. of the *Századok*, by R. F. Kaindl in vol. lxxxii. of the *Archiv für österr. Gesch.*, 1895, and by Kentrzyński in vol. xxxiv. of the *Rozprawy* of the Cracow Academy, 1897.

⁸ I have not been able to see the original edition. The book was reprinted in 1695–97 at Pressburg.

Ungariæ Rex,' or by the grace of God 'Pannoniorum Rex' or 'Hungarorum Rex,' &c.⁹

As for the 'Bull of Sylvester II,' nobody seems to have heard of it until Inchofer published its text in 1644. The editor admits that he had not seen the original himself, but, as far as we can understand him, had only a copy supplied to him by Raphael Levakovics, a Franciscan friar of Croatian origin, living at Rome, and taken from a transcript made in 1550 by the Hungarian bishop Verancsics (Nicolaus Verantius) from the original, which was then in the muniment room of the chapter of Trau in Dalmatia, but was subsequently, it is said, transferred to Venice with the rest of the more important documents belonging to the chapter. There is no record of any one else having seen the original, and moreover, if Verancsics did see it, it must have been at some other date, as he spent the whole of the year 1550 in Hungary, only occasionally visiting Vienna. He had a friend at Trau, Andronicus Tranquillus, but the extant correspondence with him is silent about the discovery of such an important document as the 'bull' of Sylvester. Other suspicious features are that in the preamble the Hungarians are described by the pope as a people unknown to him ('ignota nobis gens'), and Stephen's envoy is styled 'bishop of Kalocsa' (episcopus Colocensis)—as though Gerbert had never heard anything before about the Magyars and their inroads into Germany and various other parts of western Europe, and as though there could have been a bishop of Kalocsa without any knowledge of him in Rome. Finally Dr. Karácsonyi has shown¹⁰ that in its structure the bull totally differs from the formulæ strictly observed in the chancery of Sylvester II, and that the forger copied some of the passages from letters of Gregory VII and others from the legend of king Stephen, the latter not from any of the older texts, but from one published with certain emendations of style by Lawrence Surius in 1576. Dr. Karácsonyi prints the text of the 'bull' in three different types to distinguish the various elements. The lines (sometimes only isolated words) which supply the links by which the passages taken from Gregory's letters and the 'Life' by Hartvicius were connected by the forger, are printed in ordinary type and form a very small portion of the whole document.

Dr. Karácsonyi did not go into the question who was the forger, but Fraknoi supplies a clue to the authorship. He prints an extract from a letter written by Levakovics from Vienna to Cardinal Aldobrandini, in which the writer says that he has 'given' (i.e. sent) to the Hungarians the text of a letter of Pope

⁹ All his charters but one are in Latin. In the only Greek charter extant he styles himself 'ὁ ἅγιος Σιλβέριος ἡγουμάνος . . . χροῖα πατρὸς Οὐγγρῶν.'

¹⁰ *Szent-István király oklevelei és a Szilveszter-bulla.* Budapest, 1891.

Sylvester, which will convince them that their opinion about the extent of the power and rights of their king in spiritual matters is erroneous. He promises to take care to have the letter in question published in some way or other. It was his original intention to aver that the letter had been discovered in Rome, but on second thoughts he dared not do so without the cardinal's consent.¹¹ Aldobrandini's reply has not yet been discovered. The conclusion at which Fraknói arrives is that Levakovics was not himself the forger, because if a man is too scrupulous to spread a false report about the place of discovery without the sanction of his superiors, it is not likely that he will actually forge a document. It may, however, be urged that the friar was not above telling a deliberate falsehood, and was only afraid of the consequences of fixing upon Rome as the place of discovery without the previous knowledge and consent of his superiors. Fraknói's other contention that Rome had no hand in the perpetration of the forgery, is no doubt correct. The document, if genuine, would have materially assisted the case of the king of Hungary, who was just at that period, in 1644, engaged in a controversy with Rome regarding his claim of legateine privileges. When Gregory VII intended to lay hands on Hungary as a fief, he based his claim upon the fact—then well known, according to him, at the Hungarian court—that Stephen I had offered his kingdom to St. Peter. The forged bull also mentions this donation, and a few lines lower down makes the pope return the gift to Stephen and his legitimate successors, stipulating, however, that every lawfully elected king of Hungary should, at his accession, either personally or by envoys renew the declaration of obedience and reverence as subject of the Holy Roman Church. In continuation Sylvester is made to concede to Stephen and his heirs and legitimate successors the very power and privileges which were refused in the seventeenth century. Had Rome been anxious at that particular time to produce false evidence in support of the cause against the king of Hungary, the tenor of such document would have been totally different from that of the false bull of Sylvester.

With regard to the question as to what were the rights conferred upon Stephen by Pope Sylvester in ecclesiastical matters, the king in his charters constantly refers to some papal authority,¹² but no contemporary record exists defining the character and limits of

¹¹ 'Gran persuasione hanno gli Ungheri che nessun diritto abbia il papa al regno loro, essendo convertiti dai suoi re. Per generare a loro opinione migliore ho dato certe lettere del papa Silvestro e procurerò che vengano al publico in qualche maniera. Pensava di promulgarle come trovate a Roma; ma senza la permissione e saputa di vossignoria illustrissima non mi fidai, come Monsignor Ingoli, al quale indirizzo la copia, tutto raguagliarà.' The date of the letter is not given.

¹² Some of the expressions used in his charters are 'auctoritate Romanae Ecclesiae;' or 'cum consensu Sanctissimi Apostolici et in presentia eius nuncii;' or 'consensu et confirmatione Auctoritatis Apostolicae.'

such authority. There is, however, ample evidence forthcoming to prove that Stephen had powers conferred on him equal to those of a papal legate *a latere*. Apart from the passage contained in his life¹³ we have, for instance, the testimony of Pope Urban II,¹⁴ of King Béla IV of Hungary,¹⁵ the latter not contested by Gregory IX, and above others that of Pope Paul II, who, in 1465, refers to some canons wherein it had been placed on record that Stephen had acted as the representative of the Roman See, and had held the office of a papal legate.¹⁶ In Dr. Karácsonyi's opinion, such powers were not conferred on Stephen until about the year 1031.

LEWIS L. KROFF.

OXFORDSHIRE TRACES OF THE NORTHERN INSURGENTS OF 1065.

No one who looks through the Domesday valuations in Oxfordshire can fail to notice that, while in general they are about the same T.R.E. and T.R.W., in many good-sized manors the *valet* is much above the *valuit*. The low early values cannot be due to Norman ravages, for they all presumably go back to T.R.E., and in many cases we have full triple valuations, nor did William in his march to London go west of a line drawn from Wallingford to Buckingham. The distribution of these manors is worth noting, and I will add after each the valuations in pounds, beginning with the earliest. They lie (a) down the Cherwell; Drayton (5-8), Adderbury (12-20), Deddington (40-40-60), Somerton (9-12), Tew (20-20-40), Sandford St. Martin (10-20), Aston (10-14), Barton (12-20), Heyford (8-10-12), Middleton (18-18-30), Tackley (8-8-17), Weston (8-12), Shipton (2-4), Islip (7-8-10), Beckley (5-8); with a few further west, Chipping Norton (16-22), Chadlington (8-14), Tainton (10-10-15), Norton Brise (9-13), Stanton Harcourt (30-30-50); (b) from Oxford down the Thames; Baldon (4-4-7), Brook Hampton (6-10), Ascott (5-8), Newington (11-15), Crowmarsh (10-10-20), Newnham (12-17), Mongewell (10-14), Goring (10-10-15), Whitchurch (15-20), Mapledurham (8-8-12), Rother-

¹³ The pope is made to say: 'Ego sum apostolicus, ille [Stephanus] vero merito Christi apostolus . . . quapropter dispositioni eiusdem . . . ecclesias Dei simul cum populo utroque jure ordinandas relinquimus.' Endlicher, *Monumenta*, 172.

¹⁴ The pope writes in 1096 as follows: 'Quicquid honoris, quicquid dignitatis predecessor tuus Stephanus ab apostolica nostra ecclesia promeruisse dignoscitur.' Fejér, *Codex Diplom. Hung.* ii. 15.

¹⁵ Béla IV having been asked by the pope to occupy schismatic Bosnia, he begs, in 1238, for legatine powers in Bosnia, similar to those once enjoyed by Stephen (in Hungary), and to be allowed to have a cross borne before him and his army when proceeding through Hungary to the conquest of the new province. Theiner, *Vet. Monumenta Hung. illustr.* i. 171.

¹⁶ 'Legimus . . . [Stephanum] vices apostolice sedis . . . et officium legacionis accepisse, quod etiam in canonibus memorie proditum invenitur.' *Monum. Vaticana Hung.* ser. I. vol. vi. no. 54.